UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,940	07/31/2003	Bruce H. Hanson	FS-00900	1862

7055 7590 01/19/2007

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER	
HAGEMAN, MARK	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3653	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/19/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 01/19/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/630,940	HANSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Hageman	3653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 November 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Leo et al., referred to as the reference, in view of US 2002/0104782 to DeWitt et al. The reference discloses a plurality of input feeding devices (F_1, F_2) each randomly receiving product from a stream of product; a plurality of output groups (W_a, W_b) each having a plurality of output bins; and a control system having a mode (Fig. 1a) which constrains the input feeding devices to (i) feeding non-rejected product to output bins of assigned output groups of the plurality of output groups associated with a corresponding one of the plurality of input feeding devices (col 3, lines 10+; col 5, lines 10+). De Leo does not disclose (ii) feeding rejected product to at least one output bin of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders. De Witt discloses (ii) feeding rejected product to at least one output bin (250) of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders (460) for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, feeding rejected product to at least one output bin (250) of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

3. With regards to claim 2, DeWitt further discloses each of the plurality of input feeding devices (460) directs the rejected product from the stream of product to the at least one output bin (250) in the single group based on at least one of misreading or non-reading of a code associated with the rejected product and an operator or machine error (para 105), for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, each of the plurality of input feeding devices (460) directs the rejected product from the stream of product to the at least one output bin (250) in the single group based on at least one of misreading or non-reading of a code associated with the rejected product and an operator or machine error, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

4. With regards to claim 3, the reference further discloses a number of the plurality of input feeding devices equals a number of the plurality of output groups (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

5. With regards to claim 4, DeWitt further discloses the at least one output bin is a single reject output bin (250).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, the at least one output bin is a single reject output bin (250), as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

6. With regards to claim 5, the combination of references further inherently discloses the single reject output bin increases a capacity of processing points for sequencing the product during a second pass phase in the plurality of output groups. A reject bin inherently increases the capacity of the apparatus, as undeliverable mail is removed from the system, thus freeing up capacity.

7. With regards to claim 6, DeWitt further discloses the single reject output bin is provided in a separate output group from the plurality of output groups (para 98 lines 13-14). The reject bin (250) is a separate entity from the stacker (300) and therefore the reject bin is inherently in a separate output group.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, the single reject output bin is provided in a separate output group from the plurality of output groups, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

8. With regards to claim 7, the reference further discloses the control system assigns each input feeding 4 device to a respective one of the assigned output groups of the plurality of output group for feeding the non-rejected product during a second pass phase (Fig. 1b; col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

9. With regards to claim 8, the reference further discloses the control system constrains each input feeding device to the at least one output bin for feeding the rejected product during the second pass phase (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

10. With regards to claim 9, the reference further discloses the control system assigns each of the assigned output groups to a designated number of routes (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

11. With regards to claim 10, the reference further discloses the plurality of input feeding devices is at least two input feeding devices (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

12. With regards to claim 11, the reference further discloses the plurality of input feeding devices is four input feeding devices and the plurality of output groups is equal to a number of the plurality of input feeding devices (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

13. With regards to claim 12, the reference further discloses the control system provides the plurality of input feeding devices access to all of the plurality of output groups during a first pass phase of sorting the products (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

14. With regards to claim 13, the reference further discloses the plurality of input feeding devices is equal to a number of the plurality of output groups (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

15. With regards to claim 14, the reference further discloses the product is mail pieces (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

16. With regards to claim 15, the reference further discloses providing a plurality of product from a stream of product to any of a plurality of input devices. feeding, in a first pass phase, each product of the plurality of product to output bins based on a code associated with each product of the plurality of product; assigning each input device of the plurality of input devices to a specific output group of the plurality of output groups for a second pass phase; feeding, in the second pass phase, non-rejected product of the plurality of product to the output bins of the specific output group assigned to the each input device which is feeding the non-rejected product (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+). De Leo does not disclose feeding rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin common and accessible to any of the input devices. DeWitt discloses feeding rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin (250) common and accessible to any of the input devices (260 and para 105) for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, feeding rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin (250) common and accessible to any of the input devices, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

17. With regards to claim 16, DeWitt further discloses the rejected product is based on one of a misreading or non-reading of a code associated with the rejected product and an operator error (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, the rejected product is based on one of a misreading or non-reading of a code associated with the rejected product and an operator error, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

18. With regards to claim 17, DeWitt further discloses the rejected products are fed by each input device of the plurality of input devices (460) to the commonly accessible output bin (250 and para 105) for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, the rejected products are fed by each input device of the plurality of input devices (460) to the commonly accessible output bin, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

19. With regards to claim 18, the reference further discloses the step of determining whether the product is going through a first pass phase or a second pass phase and adjusting a control system between a first mode of operation and a second mode of operation, respectively (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

20. With regards to claim 19, DeWitt further discloses the commonly accessible output bin (250) is one of the output bins (250, 300) of the specific output group and the any of the input devices are all of the input devices for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, the commonly accessible output bin (250) is one of the output bins (250, 300) of the specific output group and the any of the input devices are all of the input devices, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

21. With regards to claim 20, the reference further discloses the product is mail pieces (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

22. With regards to claim 21, the reference further discloses means for providing a plurality of product from a stream of product; means for feeding each product of the plurality of product to output bins based on a code in a first pass phase and second pass phase; means for assigning each feeding means to a specific output group of the plurality of output groups for the second pass phase; means for constraining, in the second pass phase, non-rejected product of the plurality of product to the output bins of the specific output group assigned to the each feeding means which is feeding the non-rejected product (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+). De Leo does not disclose means for permitting rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin common and

accessible to any of the feeding means. DeWitt discloses disclose means for permitting rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin (250) common and accessible to any of the feeding means (460 and para 105) for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, means for permitting rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin (250) common and accessible to any of the feeding means, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

23. With regards to claim 22, the reference further discloses at least the means for constraining and the means for permitting is a control system operable in a first mode of operation and a second mode of operation (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

24. With regards to claim 23, the reference further discloses the product is mail pieces (col. 3, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 10+).

25. Claims 1 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walach, referred to below as the reference, in view of US 2002/0104782 to DeWitt et al. The reference discloses a plurality of input feeding devices (P) each randomly receiving product from a stream of product; a plurality of output groups (N) each having a plurality of output bins; and a control system having a mode (120) which constrains the input feeding devices to (i) feeding non-rejected product to output bins of assigned output

groups of the plurality of output groups associated with a corresponding one of the plurality of input feeding devices (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+). Walach does not disclose (ii) feeding rejected product to at least one output bin of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders. De Witt discloses (ii) feeding rejected product to at least one output bin (250) of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders (460) for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Walach to include, feeding rejected product to at least one output bin (250) of the plurality of output bins in a single group accessible to any of the plurality of input feeders, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

26. With regards to claim 2, DeWitt further discloses each of the plurality of input feeding devices (460) directs the rejected product from the stream of product to the at least one output bin (250) in the single group based on at least one of misreading or non-reading of a code associated with the rejected product and an operator or machine error (para 105), for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to have modified Walach to include, each of the plurality of input feeding devices (460) directs the rejected product from the stream of product to the at least one output bin (250) in the single group based on at least one of misreading or non-reading of a code associated with the rejected product and an operator or machine error, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

27. With regards to claim 3, the reference further discloses a number of the plurality of input feeding devices equals a number of the plurality of output groups (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

28. With regards to claim 4, DeWitt further discloses the at least one output bin is a single reject output bin (250).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Walach to include, the at least one output bin is a single reject output bin (250), as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

29. With regards to claim 5, the combination of references further inherently discloses the single reject output bin increases a capacity of processing points for sequencing the product during a second pass phase in the plurality of output groups. A reject bin inherently increases the capacity of the apparatus, as undeliverable mail is removed from the system, thus freeing up capacity.

30. With regards to claim 6, DeWitt further discloses the single reject output bin is provided in a separate output group from the plurality of output groups (para 98 lines 13-14). The reject bin (250) is a separate entity from the stacker (300) and therefore the reject bin is inherently in a separate output group.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Walach to include, the single reject output bin is provided in a separate output group from the plurality of output groups, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

31. With regards to claim 7, the reference further discloses the control system assigns each input feeding device to a respective one of the assigned output groups of the plurality of output group for feeding the non-rejected product during a second pass phase (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

32. With regards to claim 8, the reference further discloses the control system constrains each input feeding device to the at least one output bin for feeding the rejected product during the second pass phase (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

33. With regards to claim 9, the reference further discloses the control system assigns each of the assigned output groups to a designated number of routes (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

34. With regards to claim 10, the reference further discloses the plurality of input feeding devices is at least two input feeding devices (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

35. With regards to claim 11, the reference further discloses the plurality of input feeding devices is four input feeding devices and the plurality of output groups is equal to a number of the plurality of input feeding devices (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

36. With regards to claim 12, the reference further discloses the control system provides the plurality of input feeding devices access to all of the plurality of output groups during a first pass phase of sorting the products (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

37. With regards to claim 13, the reference further discloses the plurality of input feeding devices is equal to a number of the plurality of output groups (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

38. With regards to claim 14, the reference further discloses the product is mail pieces (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

39. With regards to claim 15, the reference further discloses providing a plurality of product from a stream of product to any of a plurality of input devices, feeding, in a first pass phase (120), each product of the plurality of product to output bins based on a code associated with each product of the plurality of product; assigning each input device of the plurality of input devices to a specific output group of the plurality of output groups for a second pass phase (130); feeding, in the second pass phase, non-rejected

product of the plurality of product to the output bins of the specific output group assigned to the each input device which is feeding the non-rejected product; and feeding, (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+). Walach does not disclose feeding rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin common and accessible to any of the input devices. DeWitt discloses feeding rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin (250) common and accessible to any of the input devices (260 and para 105) for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Walach to include, feeding rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin (250) common and accessible to any of the input devices, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

40. With regards to claim 16, DeWitt further discloses the rejected product is based on one of a misreading or non-reading of a code associated with the rejected product and an operator error (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Walach to include, the rejected product is based on one of a misreading or non-reading of a code associated with the rejected product and an operator error, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

41. With regards to claim 17, DeWitt further discloses the rejected products are fed by each input device of the plurality of input devices (460) to the commonly accessible output bin (250 and para 105) for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Walach to include, the rejected products are fed by each input device of the plurality of input devices (460) to the commonly accessible output bin, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

42. With regards to claim 18, the reference further discloses the step of determining whether the product is going through a first pass phase (120) or a second pass phase (130) and adjusting a control system between a first mode of operation and a second mode of operation, respectively (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

43. With regards to claim 19, DeWitt further discloses the commonly accessible output bin (250) is one of the output bins (250, 300) of the specific output group and the any of the input devices are all of the input devices for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Walach to include, the commonly accessible output bin (250) is one of the output bins (250, 300) of the specific output group and the any of the input devices are all of the input devices, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose

of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

44. With regards to claim 20, the reference further discloses the product is mail pieces (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

45. With regards to claim 21, the reference further discloses means for providing a plurality of product from a stream of product; means for feeding each product of the plurality of product to output bins based on a code in a first pass phase (120) and second pass phase; means for assigning each feeding means to a specific output group of the plurality of output groups for the second pass phase; means for constraining, in the second pass phase (130), non-rejected product of the plurality of product to the output bins of the specific output group assigned to the each feeding means which is feeding the non-rejected product; and means for permitting, in the second pass phase (130 and col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+). Walach does not disclose means for permitting rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin common and accessible to any of the feeding means. DeWitt discloses disclose means for permitting rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin (250) common and accessible to any of the feeding means (460 and para 105) for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified De Leo to include, means for permitting rejected product of the plurality of product to an output bin (250) common and accessible to any

of the feeding means, as taught by DeWitt, for the purpose of separating items which have been misread or partially read from those that have been properly processed (para 105).

46. With regards to claim 22, the reference further discloses at least the means for constraining and the means for permitting is a control system operable in a first mode of operation and a second mode of operation (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

47. With regards to claim 23, the reference further discloses the product is mail pieces (col. 3, lines 46+; col. 4, lines 10+; col. 5, lines 38+).

Response to Arguments

48. Applicant's arguments filed 11/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding both DeLeo and Walach in view of DeWitt applicant stated that the primary references teach away from the claimed invention due to the confined nature of the relationship between the inputs and output groups and that the combination with DeWitt would result in what is known in the art but not the claimed invention. Further, regarding DeWitt, applicant has stated that drop chutes are not input feeding devices. Examiner disagrees and maintains that drop chutes provide a means for inputting an object into the system and therefore do constitute input feeding devices. Therefore DeWitt does show multiple inputs in communication with a single reject bin. Thus the combination of DeLeo or Walach with DeWitt would result in the claimed invention. Rather than teaching away from the claimed invention DeLeo and Walach are simply silent regarding how to handle rejected items. Modification in view of DeWitt

provides the advantage of the capability to handle rejected items. Applicant also stated that Walach does not disclose a stream of product. Examiner maintains that Walach inherently discloses a stream of product (c9 lines 33-35).

Conclusion

49. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Hageman whose telephone number is (571) 272-3027. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Mackey can be reached on (571) 272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MCH

PATRICK MACKEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600